

PATENT
3430-0165P

IN THE U. S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants: Sung-Il PARK et al. Conf: 6907
Serial No.: 09/750,342 Art Unit: 2871
Filed: December 29, 2000 Examiner: T. Duong
For: LIQUID CRYSTAL DISPLAY DEVICE IMPLEMENTING
IMPROVED ELECTRICAL LINES AND THE FABRICATING
METHOD

APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

December 30, 2004

Sir:

Applicant hereby requests a personal interview in this Application, a Request for Continued examination having been filed on December 28, 2004.

TIME AND DATE OF INTERVIEW

Examiner Duong has kindly consented to conduct a personal interview for this Application on January 11, 2005 at 10 A.M.

ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED

I. The rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,587,160 to Lee in view of U.S.

Application No. 09/750,342
Reply to June 29, 2004 Office Action

Attorney Docket No. 3430-0165P
Page 2

Patent No. 5,684,555 to Shiba.

- II. The rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Shiba and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,945,984 to Kuwashiro.
- III. The rejection of claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,995,189 to Zhang in view of Lee and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,400,438 to Noritake et al.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF ARGUMENTS TO BE PRESENTED

Initially, with respect to claims 1-3, Applicants respectfully submit that both Lee and Shiba fail to disclose a number of positively recited features.

Furthermore, the Office Action does not make it clear why one of ordinary skill in the art would have the desire to somehow modify the dummy lines 110, 111, 112 of Lee, which are disclosed as straight and only inside of the seal, to become curved and cross the seal and to achieve the claimed invention and, if such a modification were made, how the resulting device would work at all, let alone more efficiently, unless the motivation were improper hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention.

Application No. 09/750,342
Reply to June 29, 2004 Office Action

Attorney Docket No. 3430-0165P
Page 3

In rejecting claim 4, the Office Action further relies on Kuwashiro for teaching of disposing dummy pads between data pads to inspect and repair a display. However, Applicants do not believe that Kuwashiro teaches or suggests the above cited features of claim 1 incorporated in claim 4, and therefore fails to cure the deficiencies of Lee and Shiba with respect to claim 1, from which claim 4 depends.

With respect to the rejection of claim 14, even if one were properly motivated to modify Zhang in view of Lee, which has not been demonstrated by objective factual evidence, the resulting reference combination would not meet, or render the claimed invention obvious.

Further, the Office Action fails to make out a *prima facie* case of proper motivation to modify Zhang and Lee in view of Noritake because the LCD panels of Zhang and Lee have already been formed and there would be no incentive to reform their substrates using the scribe and break method of Noritake. Nor do Zhang or Lee disclose a need for their substrates to be made as Noritake makes its substrates. Additionally, the resulting reference combination would still be missing a number of claimed features including, for example, a connection between the gate pads and the source pads, as recited, as well as the curved transmitting wires.

Application No. 09/750,342
Reply to June 29, 2004 Office Action

Attorney Docket No. 3430-0165P
Page 4

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests a personal interview on
January 11, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By *Robert Webster for* Reg. no. 46,472
James T. Eller, Jr.
Reg. No.: 39,538

JTE/RJW:mmi

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
Telephone: (703) 205-8000